

**REMARKS**

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Final Office Action dated January 26, 2005, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on April 26, 2005. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

**Examiner Interview**

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for conducting the interview on March 28, 2005. The arguments and amendments herein are presented in accordance with the substance of the interview to place the application in condition for allowance.

**Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

The Examiner rejected claims 8 and 11 as being anticipated by *Teel* (U.S. 5,603,360) and the Examiner rejected claims 8 and 11 as being unpatentable over *Haskett* (U.S. 5,253,682) in view of *Teel*. In response, Applicants have amended claims 8 and 11.

As amended, claim 8 includes the limitation of a single purpose platform which coincides with the preamble of claim 8 which states "a transportable acetylene distribution apparatus". Single purpose platform, as referenced herein, means a platform which excludes one or more storage tanks and supports only the components of the gas distribution apparatus. Additionally, as amended, claim 11 includes the limitation of a platform on which only the distribution apparatus is supported. This limitation coincides with the preamble of claim 11 which states "a distribution apparatus for regulating the flow of acetylene from an acetylene source to a point of use". This is contrasted with *Teel* which includes storage tanks and a related plumbing system connecting the storage tanks together. As shown in Figure 3 of *Teel*, the plumbing system (e.g., manifolds 40, 22, 23 indicated by the Examiner) is attached to the storage tanks (6) both of which are attached to a trailer (7). Therefore, the storage tanks (6) and the plumbing system (e.g., manifolds 40, 22, 23) disclosed in *Teel* are rigidly connected together and cannot be separated from each other so that the distribution apparatus, to

the extent defined, can be left at a delivery site while the storage tanks remain in active service.

Similarly, claims 8 and 11 are contrasted with *Haskett* which includes storage tanks and a related plumbing system connecting the storage tanks together. As shown in Figures 13 and 14 of *Haskett*, the plumbing system (e.g., manifold indicated by the Examiner) is attached to the storage tanks (2) both of which are attached to a truck bed (64). Therefore, the storage tanks (2) and the plumbing system (e.g., manifold) disclosed in *Haskett* are rigidly connected together and cannot be separated from each other so that the distribution apparatus, to the extent defined, can be left at a delivery site while the storage tanks remain in active service. These references, either alone or in combination, therefore, fail to teach or suggest all the elements recited in amended claims 8 and 11. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 8 and 11 are in condition for allowance and respectfully request withdrawal of the § 102(b) rejection and the § 103(a) rejection. Claims 9 and 10 depend from claim 8 and claims 12-15, 17, 18, and 20 depend from claim 11, and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claims 8 and 11. Applicants therefore respectfully request withdrawal of the § 102(b) rejection and the § 103(a) rejection of claims 9, 10, 12-15, 17, 18, and 20 and allowance of the same.

#### Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claim 16 as being unpatentable over *Haskett* in view of *Teel* as applied to claim 11 above, and further in view of *Miller, et al.* (U.S. 5,653,269). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claim 16 depends from claim 11. As set forth above, *Haskett* and/or *Teel* fail to teach or suggest all the limitations in claim 11. Similarly, *Miller, et al.* fails to teach or suggest all the limitations of claim 11. For this reason, neither *Haskett* and/or *Teel* and/or *Miller, et al.* can be used to render claim 16 obvious. Applicants, therefore, submit that claim 16 is in condition for allowance and respectfully request withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejection.

The Examiner rejected claim 19 as being unpatentable over *Haskett* in view of *Teel* as applied to claim 11 above, and further in view of *Lange* (U.S. 6,641,000). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claim 19 depends from claim 11. As set forth above, *Haskett* and/or *Teel* fail to teach or suggest all the limitations in claim 11. Similarly, *Lange* fails to teach or suggest all the limitations of claim 11. For this reason, neither *Haskett* and/or *Teel* and/or *Lange* can be used to render claim 19 obvious. Applicants therefore submit that claim 19 is in condition for allowance and respectfully request withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejection.

#### Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner indicated claims 1-7 are allowed. Applicants appreciate allowance of claims 1-7. As discussed with the Examiner on March 28, 2005, claims 1-7 have been amended to clarify claimed subject matter. Applicants submit no new matter has been added and Applicants respectfully request the amendments to claims 1-7 be entered.

#### New Claim

New claim 21 includes the limitations of original claim 9. Applicants believe that the references cited by the Examiner, either alone or in combination, do not teach, show, or suggest a transportable acetylene distribution apparatus, comprising a piping system disposed on a skid to allow the distribution apparatus to be moved as one unit. Therefore, Applicants believe new claim 21 is in condition for allowance, and respectfully request allowance of the same.

#### Conclusion

In conclusion, the references cited by the Examiner, alone or in combination, do not teach, show, or suggest the invention as claimed.

Having addressed all issues set out in the final office action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

PATENT  
Atty. Dtd. No. WEST/0005.D1

If the Examiner has any questions, please contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,



Walter C. Grollitsch  
Registration No. 48,678  
MOSER, PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.  
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500  
Houston, TX 77056  
Telephone: (713) 623-4844  
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846  
Attorney for Applicants

**REMARKS**

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Final Office Action dated January 26, 2005, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on April 26, 2005. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

**COPY****Examiner Interview**

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for conducting the interview on March 28, 2005. The arguments and amendments herein are presented in accordance with the substance of the interview to place the application in condition for allowance.

**Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

The Examiner rejected claims 8 and 11 as being anticipated by *Teel* (U.S. 5,603,360) and the Examiner rejected claims 8 and 11 as being unpatentable over *Haskett* (U.S. 5,253,682) in view of *Teel*. In response, Applicants have amended claims 8 and 11.

As amended, claim 8 includes the limitation of a single purpose platform which coincides with the preamble of claim 8 which states "a transportable acetylene distribution apparatus". Single purpose platform, as referenced herein, means a platform which excludes one or more storage tanks and supports only the components of the gas distribution apparatus. Additionally, as amended, claim 11 includes the limitation of a platform on which only the distribution apparatus is supported. This limitation coincides with the preamble of claim 11 which states "a distribution apparatus for regulating the flow of acetylene from an acetylene source to a point of use". This is contrasted with *Teel* which includes storage tanks and a related plumbing system connecting the storage tanks together. As shown in Figure 3 of *Teel*, the plumbing system (e.g., manifolds 40, 22, 23 indicated by the Examiner) is attached to the storage tanks (6) both of which are attached to a trailer (7). Therefore, the storage tanks (6) and the plumbing system (e.g., manifolds 40, 22, 23) disclosed in *Teel* are rigidly connected together and cannot be separated from each other so that the distribution apparatus, to

the extent defined, can be left at a delivery site while the storage tanks remain in active service.

Similarly, claims 8 and 11 are contrasted with *Haskett* which includes storage tanks and a related plumbing system connecting the storage tanks together. As shown in Figures 13 and 14 of *Haskett*, the plumbing system (e.g., manifold indicated by the Examiner) is attached to the storage tanks (2) both of which are attached to a truck bed (64). Therefore, the storage tanks (2) and the plumbing system (e.g., manifold) disclosed in *Haskett* are rigidly connected together and cannot be separated from each other so that the distribution apparatus, to the extent defined, can be left at a delivery site while the storage tanks remain in active service. These references, either alone or in combination, therefore, fail to teach or suggest all the elements recited in amended claims 8 and 11. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 8 and 11 are in condition for allowance and respectfully request withdrawal of the § 102(b) rejection and the § 103(a) rejection. Claims 9 and 10 depend from claim 8 and claims 12-15, 17, 18, and 20 depend from claim 11, and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claims 8 and 11. Applicants therefore respectfully request withdrawal of the § 102(b) rejection and the § 103(a) rejection of claims 9, 10, 12-15, 17, 18, and 20 and allowance of the same.

#### Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claim 16 as being unpatentable over *Haskett* in view of *Teel* as applied to claim 11 above, and further in view of *Miller, et al.* (U.S. 5,653,269). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claim 16 depends from claim 11. As set forth above, *Haskett* and/or *Teel* fail to teach or suggest all the limitations in claim 11. Similarly, *Miller, et al.* fails to teach or suggest all the limitations of claim 11. For this reason, neither *Haskett* and/or *Teel* and/or *Miller, et al.* can be used to render claim 16 obvious. Applicants, therefore, submit that claim 16 is in condition for allowance and respectfully request withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejection.

**COPY**PATENT  
Atty. Dkt. No. WEST/0005.D1

The Examiner rejected claim 19 as being unpatentable over *Haskett* in view of *Teel* as applied to claim 11 above, and further in view of *Lange* (U.S. 6,641,000). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claim 19 depends from claim 11. As set forth above, *Haskett* and/or *Teel* fail to teach or suggest all the limitations in claim 11. Similarly, *Lange* fails to teach or suggest all the limitations of claim 11. For this reason, neither *Haskett* and/or *Teel* and/or *Lange* can be used to render claim 19 obvious. Applicants therefore submit that claim 19 is in condition for allowance and respectfully request withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejection.

#### Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner indicated claims 1-7 are allowed. Applicants appreciate allowance of claims 1-7. As discussed with the Examiner on March 28, 2005, claims 1-7 have been amended to clarify claimed subject matter. Applicants submit no new matter has been added and Applicants respectfully request the amendments to claims 1-7 be entered.

#### New Claim

New claim 21 includes the limitations of original claim 9. Applicants believe that the references cited by the Examiner, either alone or in combination, do not teach, show, or suggest a transportable acetylene distribution apparatus, comprising a piping system disposed on a skid to allow the distribution apparatus to be moved as one unit. Therefore, Applicants believe new claim 21 is in condition for allowance, and respectfully request allowance of the same.

#### Conclusion

In conclusion, the references cited by the Examiner, alone or in combination, do not teach, show, or suggest the invention as claimed.

Having addressed all issues set out in the final office action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

PATENT  
Atty. Dkt. No. WEST/0005.D1

If the Examiner has any questions, please contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

**COPY**  


Walter C. Grollitsch

Registration No. 48,678

MOSER, PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.

3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500

Houston, TX 77056

Telephone: (713) 623-4844

Facsimile: (713) 623-4846

Attorney for Applicants